Provide illustrations and analysis of the effects of the proposed changes to the code. The body of this work will be presented to members of the PLUNC and used during Council's discussion of the legislation.

We asked the three teams to create projects on at least four types of lots in Seattle:

Lowrise 1 (L1), alley access, lot size 40' x 100'
Lowrise 1 (L1), street access, lot size 60' x 120'
Lowrise 3 (L3), street access, lot size 50' x 100'
Lowrise 3 (L3), street access, lot size 60' x 120'

In addition to the work itself, we asked the teams to provide analysis of the code as they used it to make the projects.

The renderings and analysis are intended to demonstrate both the best and worst possible outcomes using the proposed Multifamily Code.

At least one L1 scheme should assume SF zoning at the back property line or across a back alley. The team may use site contexts within a 15 minute walk of transit. Station area (parking) contexts are allowed, but may not be the context for more than 50 percent of a team's schemes.

Teams may not assume granting of departures from the proposed code except for solid waste & recycling container areas. At least one scheme must use the proposed requirements for solid waste & recycling container areas. Teams may highlight in presentation where other departures through administrative design review would be of benefit.

Scheme presentations should include **four fixed views**: 3/32" site plan, aerial on a diagonal and from the sidewalk. Each presentation should include **two 3/32" site cross sections**: side to side and front to back, including the adjacent buildings. **Presentation boards should be 24" x 36" using a prescribed layout.**

Best Case Schemes – Of the required schemes, at least 3 should depict "good" outcomes enabled by the proposed code. Councilmembers are particularly interested in helping the market provide a variety of housing beyond townhouses – mews, pedestrian courtyard, rowhouses, and cottages.

Consideration should be given to meeting the goals and objectives as described in the materials created by the Department of Planning and Development (DPD), as well as other social and environment benefits. The DPD's goals and objectives include:

1. Improved design, including better facades, front doors that face streets, more landscaping around parking areas, improved garage design, lower fences
2. Promotion of green buildings
3. Encouragement of a variety of housing, including affordable housing
4. Protection of single family neighborhoods

Worst Case Schemes – Of the required schemes, at least 3 should be depict "poor" outcomes enabled by the proposed code. The designs must be rational, not just bad. Councilmembers would like to anticipate loopholes or basic, market-driven factors that might lead to unintended outcomes.

Explore the flexibility of the proposed Multifamily Code lowrise changes and discover if they can be used to produce benefits to the developer at the expense neighboring property owners, residents of the units or the public realm. Potential questions include:

1. Can FAR definitions be gamed to create extra development potential?
2. Can green factor be gamed to produce developments with reduced open space and neighborhood appeal?
3. Can reduced setbacks & lack of width/depth maximums be used to create bulky designs?
4. What does a 4-pack look like when designed using the proposed MFU flexibility?
5. Will removal of density limits create shoe-box size housing units?

2) Analysis & Evaluation – For each scheme Teams shall provide a summary analysis of the following:

1. **Tabular Data:** Lot size, unit count, unit density, FAR, total gross square footage, lot coverage, building heights, impervious surface, open space/lot size ratio, open space and open space at grade, total amenity space, Green Factor calculations, and parking count. *Compile tabular data in the format provided.*
2. **Enabling factors:** Discuss the specific aspects of the code that make the scheme possible, compared with current code.
3. **Gating mechanisms:** Discuss the specific elements of the code which limit the scheme.
4. **Cost factors:** Discuss elements of the scheme where code mandates have created additional development cost when compared with current requirements.
5. **Evaluation:** Identify potential alterations to the code and their potential effects on the scheme, either positive or negative.